



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/044,294 | 10/26/2001 | Lawrence J. Karr | 50037.65USU1/177809.2 | 7483 |
| 27488 | 7590 | 10/02/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903 | | | NGUYEN, DUC M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2618 | |

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/044,294 | KARR ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Duc M. Nguyen | 2618 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,40-42 and 44-61 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 40-42, 44-61 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 12/12/05. Claims 1, 40-42, 44-61 are now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 42, 50-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As to claim 42, the claim recites "a third format that is different from the first and second format" limitation, this limitation contains new subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said

Art Unit: 2618

subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lorang et al (US Pat No. 5,548,814).

Regarding claim 40, Lorang discloses a wireless communication (paging) system having local and wide-area reception modes, comprising :

- a broadcast transmitter (20) configured to transmit to a device (12) over a FM subcarrier channel to a wide area (see Figs. 1, 5-6, col. 5, lines 18-22, col. 8, lines 21-28 regarding wide area, col. 10, lines 63-64 regarding standard paging FM architecture); and

- a localcast transmitter (42, 96, 112) coupled to a data source and configured to transmit over a local area and in a locally-unused FM frequency (see Figs. 1, 4, 6 and col. 8, lines 21-28 regarding local area, col. 10, lines 62-63 regarding standard FM architecture as a candidate for the lower power two-way link);

- a mobile device (PDU 10) including a transceiver (see Fig. 10) and is configured to receive and transmit data from/to the localcast transmitter, and further configured to receive transmitted data from a wide-area broadcast transmitter (see col. 12, lines 44-45) and from another mobile device (see col. 7, lines 15-16);

- different information for local information (data transfer information) and broadcast (Request for location message) information (see col. 7, lines 49-67);

As to the limitation regarding "conveying information to a user interface of the mobile device", it is noted that a mobile device would inherently comprise a user

interface in order to encode and transmit an information signal, or in order to receive (or convey) and decode an information signal. For examples, the mobile device would comprise an interface to transmit/receive a message, an interface for presenting data to a user (i.e, a display, a speaker), an interface for input/output operations such as keypad, menu display, etc. (see also col. 6, lines 5-20 regarding interface 62).

Further, since the structure of the circuits in Fig. 10 would illustrate a transceiver with a broadest reasonable interpretation because of the sharing of frequency synthesizer, MUX, protocol processor, RAM, and ROM components, the claimed limitation regarding a transceiver for receiving in a broadcast mode, receiving and conveying information in a localcast mode is made obvious by **Lorang**.

Regarding claim 41, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 40 above. In addition, it is clear that Lorang would disclose different transmission format for local mode and broadcast mode as claimed (see col. 9, lines 40-44, col. 11, lines 29-31 and col. 12, lines 34-41). Also note that different data rates would obviously comprise different modulation schemes.

5. Claims 1, 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lorang** in view of **Miyaki et al (US Pat No. 5,903,618)**.

Regarding claim 1, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 40 above. In addition, it is clear that **Lorang** would disclose all the claimed limitations, see claim 40, except for a peer-to-peer mode. However, it is noted such a peer-to-peer mode is known in the art as disclosed by **Miyake** (see Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 25-30).

Since **Larang** and **Miyake** are analogous arts, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the above teaching of **Miyaki** to **Larang** for further providing a peer-to-peer mode to PDUs in **Larang** as well, thereby providing a mobile device with a peer-to-peer mode as claimed, so that a groups of pagers which are close to each other can communicate to each other without the need for a signal has to be transmitted via a base station or a service center, thereby the time for communication between the two terminals can be shortened (see **Miyaki**, col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 2). Note that the peer-to-peer mode and the localcast mode would obviously use the same transmission bandwidth of a bi-directional (or two-way) communication link.

Regarding claim 42, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, **Lorang** would disclose different transmission format for local mode and broadcast mode as claimed (see col. 9, lines 40-44, col. 11, lines 29-31 and col. 12, lines 34-41). Also note that different data rates would obviously comprise different modulation schemes. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a third format for peer-to-peer mode, in order to reduce interferences among messages transmitting in broadcast mode, localcast mode and peer-to-peer mode.

6. Claims 44-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Larang** in view of **Miyaki** and further in view of **Chadwick et al (US 5,442,646)**.

Regarding claim 44, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, although **Larang** is silent on components of a broadcast transmitter (see Fig. 3), it is noted that components such as I/O controller, interfaces, encoder, frequency control processor, data packets, subframes and frames at a subcarrier and subcarrier signal generator as described in **Chadwick** (see Fig. 2, col. 4, line 36 – col. 34) for encoding and transmitting digital data into control packets are components obviously required for either the localcast transmitter or the broadcast transmitter, in order to encode and transmit digital data into control and data packets in subframes or frames. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and modify the above teachings of **Chadwick, Larang and Miyaki** for provide components as claimed, in order for a transceiver being able to reassemble input data into packets for re-transmission.

Regarding claims 45-49, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since such components (data and uplink signaling information) as recited in the claims are known in the art (Official Notice), in order for a transceiver to receive input data, reassemble data into packets for transmission, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above teachings of **Chadwick, Larang and Miyaki** for provide components as claimed, in order for a transceiver being able to reassemble input data into packets for re-transmission.

Regarding claim 50, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 42 above. In addition, although **Larang** is silent on components of a localcast

transmitter (see Fig. 3), it is noted that components such as I/O controller, interfaces, encoder, frequency control processor, data packets, subframes and frames at a subcarrier and subcarrier signal generator as described in **Chadwick** (see Fig. 2, col. 4, line 36 – col. 34) for encoding and transmitting digital data into control packets are components obviously required for either the localcast transmitter or the broadcast transmitter, in order to encode and transmit digital data into control and data packets in subframes or frames. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above teachings of **Chadwick**, **Larang** and **Miyaki** for provide components as claimed, in order for a transceiver being able to reassemble input data into packets for re-transmission.

Regarding claims 51-55, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 50 above. In addition, since such components (data and uplink signaling information) as recited in the claims are known in the art (Official Notice), in order for a transceiver to receive input data, reassemble data into packets for transmission, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above teachings of **Chadwick**, **Miyaki** and **Larang** for provide components as claimed, in order for a transceiver being able to reassemble input data into packets for re-transmission.

Regarding claim 56, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 42 above. In addition, **Larang** discloses microprocessors, interfaces, antenna, RAM and EEPROM memory for the pager (see Fig. 10 and col. 11, line 25 – col. 12, line 41). Further, although **Larang** fails to disclose a realtime component, it is noted that such

Art Unit: 2618

realtime component is known in the art (Official Notice), in order for a transceiver to synchronize for receiving and transmitting data packets in certain timeslots. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above teachings of **Chadwick, Miyaki and Larang** to provide a realtime components as claimed, in order to receive and transmit data packets synchronously.

Regarding claims **57-58**, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 42 above. In addition, **Larang** discloses a two-way PDU being able to receive or transmit a signal to another device (see col. 7, lines 15-16).

Regarding claim **59**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 42 above. In addition, it is clear that when receiving a signal from another device, such signal is transmitted/received in a localcast mode from PDUs.

Regarding claim **60**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 42 above. In addition, **Larang** discloses the device receive both transmission modes using substantially the same circuitry (see Fig. 10).

Regarding claim **61**, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 56 above.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to claims 1, 40-42, in the response filed 7/19/06, Applicant contends that none of the cited arts, either singly and in combination, suggest or teach a transceiver

receiving in a broadcast mode, receiving and conveying information in a localcast mode, and receiving and conveying information in a peer-to-peer mode. Based further on Applicant's argument on page 17 regarding Lorang' reference with respect to separate adapters 16 associated with the Tx/Rx 16 for communication between the mobile unit and LAN network, it appears to the examiner that Applicant has assumed that the "claimed mobile device" comprises only a single transceiver, namely a single transmitter and a single receiver, and that this single receiver of the transceiver is utilized or shared to receive data in broadcast mode, in localcast mode, and in a peer-to-peer mode. Therefore, Lorang fails to teach a **transceiver** receiving broadcast data in a broadcast mode because Lorang teaches a separate receiver 12 for receiving broadcast data in a broadcast mode.

In response, the examiner asserts that, with the broadest reasonable interpretation, Lorang, in view of Miyake, would teach a transceiver receiving in a broadcast mode, receiving and conveying information in a localcast mode, and receiving and conveying information in a peer-to-peer mode. The reasons are outlined below,

a- The specification fails to provide detailed drawing of a transceiver circuit for the claimed mobile device that would clarify the limitation of a transceiver that receives data in a broadcast mode, and would distinguish such limitation from the Lorang's reference.

b- By examining Fig. 10 in Lorang's reference regarding the transmission circuits of the mobile device, the examiner believes that the structure of the circuits in Fig. 10

would illustrate a transceiver with a broadest reasonable interpretation. Therefore, this transceiver would receive data in a broadcast mode, and would receive and transmit data in a localcast mode. In addition, in view of Miyaki, this transceiver would further receive and convey data in a peer-to-peer mode (i.e, utilizing and sharing LAN communication transceiver circuits).

c- Since the receiver 12 and the Rx/TX 16 of the PDU 10 sharing frequency synthesizer, MUX, protocol processor, RAM, ROM, the reasonable interpretation for the structure of the circuits in Fig. 10 as a transceiver is proper (i.e, a transceiver operating in more than one system).

For foregoing reasons, the examiner believes that the pending claims, which rely on the patentability of a transceiver receiving data in a broadcast mode, are not allowable over the cited prior art.

Conclusion

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry)
(571)-273-7893 (for informal or draft communications).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Customer Service Window,
Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7893, Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

Or to Matthew Anderson (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (571) 272-4177.

Duc M. Nguyen
Sept 26, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Duc M. Nguyen".